

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box. 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/614,477	07/07/2003	Kevin Moore	ITW-14218.70	7793	
7590 11/17/2004			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Kevin D. Erickson			SIPOS,	SIPOS, JOHN	
Pauley Petersen	Kinne & Erickson				
Suite 365			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
2800 West Higgins Road			3721	,	
Hoffman Estate					

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		1	10/614,477	MOORE, KEVIN			
	Office Action Summary	E	xaminer	Art Unit			
		J	ohn Sipos	3721			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	ication appea	rs on the cover sheet with the co	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on 02 Sent	ember 2004.				
′=	•		ction is non-final.				
3)□	, <del></del>						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 25-31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>						
Applicati	on Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accept	ed or b)☐ objected to by the E	xaminer.			
	Applicant may not request that any obje	ction to the dra	wing(s) be held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of: <ol> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ol> </li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
2) Notice 3) Information	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or						
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/7/03</u> . 6) ☐ Other:							

## REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS BASED ON FORMAL MATTERS

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. '112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8,10 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "turner/diverter" is unclear in that no function or definition for either "turner" or "diverter" is set forth in the claims. Furthermore, it is unclear in the claims whether these two words are directed to a single mechanism performing the same function.

## REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS BASED ON PRIOR ART

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. '103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10,12-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Schlueter (3,991,640). The patent to Schlueter shows a package forming machine comprising of a carrier stock feed drum 32, a jaw drum 14, a carrier stock feed trough 36, an container input orienting conveyor 11, a package turner/diverter 41,42 and cut-off wheel 44 with a plurality of knives 50. Although the controller for the whole machine of Schlueter is not set forth, it is inherent that a controller synchronizes all the various mechanisms

of the machine. The use of an electronic controller system is well known in the packaging art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use an electronic one to increase the efficiency of the machine.

The use of color-coded elements of a machine (claims 3-5), adjustable jaws and drums (claims 6,11,14-16, 23 and 24), proximity sensors (claims 8 and 17) and container star wheels (claim 13) are well known int eh container packing art and the modification of Schlueter accordingly would have been obvious to one skilled in the art for their known benefits.

Claim 18 is are rejected under 35 U.S.C. '103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Shlueter (3,991,640), as applied to the claims above, and further in view of the patent to Cunningham (5,054,257). The patent to Cunningham shows a package forming machine comprising of a carrier stock feed mechanism, a jaw drum 29, an container input orienting conveyor 15, a package turner/diverter conveyor with a plurality of lugs (see Figure 4) and cut-off mechanism. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the Schlueter machine with a turner/diverter conveyor having a plurality of lugs to orient and feed the packages out of the machine. The use of interchangeable lugs on a conveyor to allow for different size packages is well known in the art and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to provide the Schlueter/Cunningham conveyor with such lugs to allow the manufacturing of different size packages.

## ADDITIONAL REFERENCES CITED

The following prior art is made of record but has not been relied upon in the rejection of claims. However, the prior art is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The cited patents show container packaging machines with stock drums, jaw drums and cutting mechanisms.

The patent to Ungarshows a cutting wheel with a plurality of knives.

The patent to Griffin shows a machine with package orienting conveyors with lugs (see Figure 9).

The patent to Cervantes,	Weaver and Krogman show adjustable machine	es.
*.		

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to **Examiner John Sipos** at telephone number **571-272-4668**. The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 4:00 PM Monday through Thursday.

The FAX number for Group 3700 of the Patent and Trademark Office is (703) 872-9302.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Rinaldi Rada, can be reached at 571-272-4467.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

John Sipos

Primary Examiner